

when thinking out plans for reform of London education,
and rejected the notion of crushing the denominational schools out of existence

"I had seen in the United States and Victoria (Australia) the consequences of such action, I did not like the policy of crushing out minorities I thought the imposition of 'un-denominational Christianity' as unfau to the Jews, Unitarians, and Secularists, as the imposition of the Anglican Church Catechism on Roman Catholics and Nonconformists, or of the Roman Catholic formularies on Protestants Moreover, I knew that the result would not be the closing of the Roman Catholic schools, but (as in the United States) their continuance entirely at private cost at a still lower level of efficiency, \ which would be calamitous for the very large and perhaps growing number of children who would resort to them Above all, I wanted to preserve variety in education, rather than an officially prescribed uniformity—variety in methods of teaching, variety in the subjects taught, and variety in * atmospheres ⁵ I wanted to leave the door open to new and unthought of experiments in schools "

"For all these reasons,⁵⁵ he goes on,

"when the Conservative Government in 1902 proposed to find out of the rates and government grants the salaries of the teachers in these Anglican and Roman Catholic Schools, and to put these, like all other public elementary schools, under the administration of the County and Borough Councils, I gave this measure my hearty support, and have never since regretted my decision "

"Hearty support⁵⁵ is, as a matter of historic fact, not quite the right description for his action It is the truth, but by no means the whole truth Politically, of course, the Balfour Government is the author of the Acts of 1902 and 1903, but their "onlie begetter⁵⁵ is the author of Fabian

Tract No 106,—The Education Muddle and the Way
Out
On its title-page, this Tract bears no name
In its first
form, it was not drafted by Sidney Webb
indeed, he ob-
jected to the original draft Thereupon it
was remitted
to him to re-draft, as published in 1901 it was
his handi-
work Before it actually appeared in this
form, Sir John